Dawkins Revised

Paweł Bloch

AI and the Logical Fallacy in the Central Thesis of The God Delusion

Verification of Arguments Using Artificial Intelligence

Dawkins Revised

AI and the Logical Fallacy in the Central Thesis of The God Delusion

Nr 1

Paweł Bloch

Original Title: Dawkins poprawiony

Original Subtitle: *AI wobec błędu logicznego w tezie głównej „Boga urojonego”*

Series Number: 1

Author: Paweł Bloch

Flavius Publishing
Warsaw 2025
Translation: Grok3/ChatGPT-4o – edited by the author

ISBN: 978-83-969690-7-1

Table of Contents

THE CORE OF THE DISPUTE **6**

GROK3 VERDICT **7**

INTRODUCTION **8**

ANTI-DIVINE SOPHISM (ADS) 10

1. STRICT ANALYSIS OF THE CENTRAL THESIS **11**

FOUNDATIONS OF THE STRICT ANALYSIS OF ADS 11
VERIFICATION OF THE "EXCLUSIVITY" ASSUMPTION OF EVOLUTION 11
THE PROBLEM OF THE AXIOM AND THE ERROR OF *PETITIO PRINCIPII* 12
CHATGPT O3 ANALYSIS OF THE *PETITIO PRINCIPII* ERROR: HOW THE PREMISE "SMUGGLES" THE CONCLUSION 12
THREE INTERPRETATIVE VARIANTS OF THE MAIN THESIS 13

2. THE ANTI-DIVINE SOPHISM: A PROBABILISTIC AND JOURNALISTIC (PUBLICISTIC) ANALYSIS **13**

DEFINING THE SCOPE OF THE ANTI-DIVINE SOPHISM 13
THE *NON SEQUITUR* ERROR IN PROBABILISTIC AND PUBLICISTIC INTERPRETATIONS 14
Re: 1. Analysis of the Non Sequitur Error – Probabilistic Interpretation *14*
Re: 2. Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Error – Publicistic Interpretation *14*
ChatGPT-4o Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Error – Publicistic Version *15*

3. WHY THE MAIN THESIS OF *THE GOD DELUSION* CONTAINS LOGICAL ERRORS **16**

CATEGORICAL ERROR AND TRIVIALIZATION OF THE ANTI-DIVINE SOPHISM 16
CONCEPTUAL ERROR – NATURALISM CANNOT ADJUDICATE THE SUPERNATURAL 16
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE ABSOLUTENESS OF THE ANTI-DIVINE SOPHISM 16
ERROR OF INCONSISTENCY WITH NATURALISM 17
INCONSISTENCY WITH NATURALISM ERROR 17

CONCLUSION **17**

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES **20**

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE 20

GROK3 AI ANALYSIS **42**

VERIFICATION OF LOGICAL FALLACIES IN THE CONTEXT OF *THE GOD DELUSION* **48**

QUESTIONS FOR THE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE **51**

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE: 51

EPILOGUE **52**

The Core of the Dispute

Concept of Dawkins's Central Thesis: *A Bridge Between Evolutionism and Atheism*

Book: *The God Delusion*

Chapter 2: *"The God Hypothesis"*

„Instead I shall define the God Hypothesis more defensibly*: there exists a superhuman, supernatural intelligence who deliberately designed and created the universe and everything in it, including us*. This book will advocate an alternative view: *any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution.* Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it. God, in the sense defined, is a delusion; and, as later chapters will show, a pernicious delusion."[1]

VS

P. Bloch's Thesis: *The Absence of a Bridge Between Evolutionism and Atheism*

Book: *Richard Dawkins' God Delusion*

Chapter 1: *The unproven statements*

"The biological evolution is the key to Dawkins' atheism. At the beginning of his deliberations, he stated: 'This book will advocate a [...] view: any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution'[2].

Referring to the book The God Delusion (including in particular chapter 4 – Why there almost certainly is no God), it should be stated that a 'defence' proclaimed by the Oxford professor was unsuccessful because, in the content of his work, Dawkins did not present the analysis confirming that 'any creative intelligence... can arise exclusively as a product... of gradual evolution'. So he did not prove that evolution is the only way that allows the creation of such 'intelligence', including God.

In the next sentence, the author said: 'Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it'.

It is tacitly assumed in the above statement that before the creation of the universe there was no other reality. However, such an argument requires a proof, which is missing in the analysis of a scholar. It should be remembered that in religion (e.g. Christianity) the transcendence rather than immanence of God towards the universe is assumed. Therefore, 'creative intelligences, being evolved' do not have to «arrive late in the universe»."[3]

---

[1] Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (London: Transworld Publishers, 2007), p. 52.

[2] R. Dawkins, *The God Delusion*, p. 52. The meaning of the sentence was given.

[3] Paweł Bloch, *Richard Dawkins' God Delusion*, translated by A. Blicharz, Flavius Publishing Hause, Warsaw, 2014, p. 34.

AI VERDICT

Question to Grok3:

Study the following analysis thoroughly and verify the arguments presented for logical correctness. Answer whether the main thesis of *The God Delusion* (the so-called Anti-Divine Sophism) contains the logical error of *petitio principii* or *non sequitur*.

Grok3 Verdict

The main thesis of *The God Delusion*, the Anti-Divine Sophism, contains the logical error of *petitio principii* in its strict, deductive form. The premise that all creative intelligence arises only through evolution assumes the conclusion that a non-evolved intelligence (God) cannot exist, rendering the argument circular. Additionally, in its probabilistic or rhetorical interpretations, it commits *non sequitur*, as the conclusion "God is a delusion" does not follow from the premises without unproven assumptions or a formal evidential link. Thus, the ADS contains both fallacies, depending on its interpretation, with *petitio principii* being the primary error in its core presentation.

Answer: Yes, the main thesis of *The God Delusion* (the Anti-Divine Sophism) contains the logical error of *petitio principii*.

Grok3 (Think), 2025

Introduction

In 2006, Oxford professor Richard Dawkins published the book *The God Delusion*. His fundamental argument was built on a simple idea, which I would describe as follows: evolution implies that God does not exist. More precisely: all intelligence, including God, can arise exclusively from evolution. Therefore, evolution preceded the emergence of any intelligence, including God. Thus, God cannot exist, because hypothetically, He would be a creation later than the emergence of the universe. It is worth quoting here the fundamental argument, the main thesis of the book *The God Delusion*, which I have called in this work the Anti-Divine Sophism (ADS):

Original text:

"Instead I shall define the God Hypothesis more defensibly: *there exists a superhuman, supernatural intelligence who deliberately designed and created the universe and everything in it, including us*. This book will advocate an alternative view: *any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution*. Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it. God, in the sense defined, is a delusion; and, as later chapters will show, a pernicious delusion."

Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*, Chapter 2, The God Hypothesis

Richard Dawkins declares that his book will defend this opinion. Therefore, there are grounds to consider the aforementioned reasoning as the main thesis of his work, and that is how I accept it in this analysis. Is this a significant thesis? Yes, because if it were true, we would conclude that God does not exist. The key to understanding the above statement is the word "only," which I interpret as "exclusively" in this context, as it does not allow for alternatives, no other possibilities. Intelligence, according to Dawkins, can emerge exclusively through biological processes observed in nature. However, this thesis, which we might call the "exclusivity" of evolution, is controversial. The reason is that there is no evidence confirming such "exclusivity," which results in the entire reasoning lacking a logical foundation. Therefore, this premise does not justify the conclusion that God is a delusion. In the following considerations, I will demonstrate why R. Dawkins failed to build a bridge between atheism and evolution. The main thesis of *The God Delusion* contains a logical error of *petitio principii* or *non sequitur*.

Is there a simple way to deeply understand the entire problem? Yes. If we ask ourselves: do we have proof that an intelligent being can arise exclusively through evolution, then we will understand the essence of the issue. Because that is precisely what R. Dawkins's reasoning is based on. There is no such proof. I pointed out this fact in my polemical book from 2011, *The Delusional God of Richard Dawkins*. The Oxford professor simply assumes that this is the case but does not present proof for this thesis, which has serious consequences for his entire reasoning. Therefore, the main thesis is not proof of the "delusion of God" but at most reveals the author's illusory belief.

The first problem that arises in the presented analyses is whether the main thesis can be "torn out of context" of the book and analyzed separately from other parts of *The God Delusion*? Yes, because it was constructed in such a way, but with an important caveat and a few less significant ones. The book is supposed to demonstrate the "exclusivity" of evolution as the only mechanism for the emergence of intelligence, and this aspect must be taken into account. As we know, neither the book *The God Delusion* nor available scientific knowledge provides evidence for the "exclusivity" of evolution as the only mechanism for the emergence of intelligence. On the contrary, this absolutism of intelligence arising only through evolution is in a certain dimension undermined by so-called Artificial Intelligence. Although AI still originates from biological human beings, AI itself did not evolve biologically, which is significant in the context of the discussed issue. It breaks the certainty of this argument. Other parts of the book, apart from naturalism as the starting point of Dawkins's methodology and the use of the probability argument, do not contribute much to the reasoning of the main thesis, so they can be considered insignificant. To ensure the reader, at the end of the publication, I included an analysis of the entire book *The God Delusion* conducted by artificial intelligence to verify whether the argumentation used in this work is not in any way undermined by it. The AI (Grok3 Think) found nothing that would indicate this, so I have methodological grounds to present the work in the above form. I encourage everyone to conduct their own comparative analysis using the most modern information technologies.

The second question worth addressing is how to interpret the main thesis? Should it be read exactly as it is written – strictly logically? That is, that intelligence can arise "exclusively" as a product of evolution? Or should it be treated as a more cautious statement, that intelligence can arise with high probability as a product of evolution? This second interpretation would stem from the general views of R. Dawkins expressed in other parts of his book. Or perhaps neither possibility should be considered, as the main thesis has no logical claims and is only a rhetorical, persuasive statement, let's call it publicistic?

There are certain reasons for each of the three options mentioned, so in this work, we will consider each of them separately:

1. Strict Interpretation

This is the primary understanding, as it directly follows from the content of the main thesis. R. Dawkins creates strict interpretative frameworks. Concepts such as God and delusion have been defined. God is a supernatural being, and delusion is: "a persistent false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence…" Furthermore, God is to be understood as a scientific hypothesis: "the God hypothesis" is nothing other than a certain scientific hypothesis concerning the Universe. The main thesis was also formulated in the form of premises "any," "only" "necessary," and the conclusion "therefore." A strict reasoning is clearly visible. Also, the concept of delusion, whose definition was quoted above, clearly indicates that we are dealing here with a "proof" that is strong and at the same time ignored. Ignoring this proof is an accusation aimed at the reader who would like to deny it. Additionally, the reference to evolution as the foundation of reasoning also indicates scientific aspirations. These are strong premises to interpret the main thesis in a strictly

logical way. This work will show that the weakness of this reasoning is the error of *petitio principii*, that is, assuming (hiding) in the premise what the main thesis was yet to prove.

2. Probabilistic Interpretation

Although the main thesis contains no references to probability and is expressed unequivocally, it is worth considering its less rigorous interpretation, taking into account the context of the entire book. In this understanding, the main thesis would not have any claims to absolute proof, but only to proof within the bounds of probability. It would be an induction based on the fact that since every observable intelligence comes from evolution, so does every possible one. The weakness of this reasoning is that R. Dawkins does not present a probabilistic model, which makes the word "probable" only an intuitive term. There is no logical transition between the premises of the main thesis and the conclusion "God is a delusion." Furthermore, God in the ADS is defined as a supernatural being, so he is of a different category than a material being. To use probability scientifically, it would be necessary not only to build a probabilistic model but also to take into account categorical differences.

3. Publicistic Interpretation

Thirdly, it is necessary to consider the option that both the deductive and probabilistic interpretations are false because the main thesis has no claims to logical rigor or scientific proof, but is a loose, publicistic thesis, not suitable for serious logical analysis. The conclusion that God is a delusion does not follow from strict reasoning and does not constitute a "strong counter-proof," but only aims to suggestively convince the reader to believe in the correct conduct of such a proof. In other words, the main thesis does not pretend to scientifically demonstrate that "God is a delusion." The weakness of this approach is that Dawkins defines delusion as a false belief maintained despite strong counter-evidence. To recognize God as a delusion, he would have to provide strong evidence, but the publicistic method, unlike the scientific ones (see points 1 and 2), does not provide such evidence because it inherently relinquishes it. As a result, the connection between the premises and the conclusion is erroneous (*non sequitur*), and the conclusion that God is a delusion does not follow from the premises even more so than in points 1 and 2. Among the three interpretations, this one has no scientific basis, reducing the used concept of "delusion" to an invective.

(On page 8 and at the end of the study, in the chapter "Questions for the artificial intelligence," there are 11 questions to which artificial intelligence, when analyzing this text, should provide answers to the reader to give a reliable picture of this work.)

Anti-Divine Sophism (ADS)

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate that the main thesis (the so-called Anti-Divine Sophism) of the book *The God Delusion*, in its strict interpretation, contains the logical error of *petitio principii*, while in its interpretative versions (probabilistic or publicistic) it contains the error of non-sequitur.

1. Strict Analysis of the Central Thesis

Let us examine the following phrase from the central thesis, as articulated by Richard Dawkins: "[…] *any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution*. Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it." (*The God Delusion*, Chapter 2, The God Hypothesis)

a) Let us isolate the sentence: *any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution.* This sentence can be condensed to the following content: *intelligence originates solely from evolution* (observation: this is an unfalsifiable axiom).

b) *Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it.* In other words: *intelligence cannot create the universe.* Conclusion: all possible intelligent entities evolved, which also applies to a supernatural entity such as, potentially, God. Therefore, God could not have created the universe, as evolution emerged after the formation of the universe, not before.

Foundations of the Strict Analysis of ADS

The assumption of the "exclusivity" of evolution constitutes the key foundation on which the entire structure of the Anti-Divine Sophism is built. If this assumption is correct, then a proof is presented for the conclusion: God is a delusion. Let us quote the definition of delusion provided by the author of ADS himself: "false beliefs held in the face of strong contradictory evidence..." For God to be considered a delusion—as is the case in ADS—there must exist strong contradictory evidence that is ignored by its adherents. If so, it must be assumed that the premises of ADS are intended to serve as this evidence. Therefore, there are grounds to analyze ADS in a strict manner—especially since Richard Dawkins himself assumes that the God hypothesis should be treated as a scientific hypothesis. [4]

Verification of the "Exclusivity" Assumption of Evolution

What exactly is the premise of the "exclusivity" of evolution as the only possible means of the emergence of intelligence? It assumes, in an absolute sense, that no known physical law, no chemical interactions, nor even yet-undiscovered laws of nature allow for any other possibility of the emergence of intelligence except through evolutionary processes. Proving such "exclusivity" poses an extremely difficult challenge, as it would require demonstrating that no other mechanism—beyond evolution—can lead to the emergence of intelligence. Such a proof would need to encompass the entirety of the laws of physics, chemistry, and biology, which currently exceeds the boundaries of scientific knowledge. Therefore, upon examining the premise of the "exclusivity" of evolution, it becomes clear that it has not been proven, nor is there any realistic prospect in the near future for its empirical

[4] R. Dawkins, *Bóg urojony*, s. 11.

confirmation.
It is worth noting that for Richard Dawkins to draw the unequivocal conclusion that God is a delusion, he must accept as true—or consider proven—the assumption of the exclusivity of evolution. Otherwise, his conclusion lacks a logical foundation. Thus, the "exclusivity" of evolution is an assumption taken as true, yet simultaneously unproven and unfalsifiable—an axiom, which entails specific logical consequences.

The Problem of the Axiom and the Error of *Petitio Principii*

The adoption of the axiom of the "exclusivity" of evolution leads directly to the conclusion of God's non-existence. If only evolution can lead to the emergence of any intelligence, and it occurs only after the universe comes into existence, then it is impossible to accept that God—who would have to arise through evolution—could simultaneously have created the universe. The conclusion of God's non-existence or His "delusion" is thus already contained within the premise of the "exclusivity" of evolution. Yet, this very thesis was supposed to be the subject of proof, not an axiomatic assumption. The above reasoning renders the entire argumentation tautological and, therefore, burdened with the error of *petitio principii*. There is no additional evidential step that would elevate the conclusion beyond the axiom itself. Moreover, the same problem of logical error emerges from the foundations of naturalism itself, which in this context was adopted as a default assumption rather than the result of an independent proof.
We see here a lack of consistency in Richard Dawkins's own assumptions. Tautological reasoning does not constitute highly persuasive proof—it is a self-referential construct based on unproven assumptions.
Meanwhile, to speak of delusions—understood as "false beliefs held in the face of strong contradictory evidence"—one would need precisely such strong, external evidence. A tautological proof, stemming from the adoption of an axiom, does not meet this criterion.
Conclusion: I have demonstrated that the main thesis of the book *The God Delusion* does not meet the formal conditions of an argument in its strict version and is burdened with the logical error of *petitio principii*. [5]

ChatGPT o3 Analysis of the *Petitio Principii* Error: How the Premise "Smuggles" the Conclusion

"Any creative intelligence (...) comes into existence exclusively as the product of gradual evolution"

1. Dawkins's Definition of God – "a supernatural designer of the universe" (an intelligence existing before or outside the cosmos)

[5] Similar conclusions were reached by Norman J. Lund. In *Richard Dawkins Debunked: A Dozen Logical Fallacies in The God Delusion*, he wrote succinctly: "Begging the Question (circular reasoning): Dawkins constantly assumes that which he purports to prove, namely, that a godless process of evolution is the cause of everything, including "apparent design." For example, he asserts that: "Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it" (p. 52). Although Dawkins claims that he will "show" the reader evidence for this belief, he fails to deliver."

2. Logical Consequence of the Word "Exclusively"
    - If every creative intelligence is a product of evolution, then no intelligence exists prior to the evolutionary process.
    - However, a designer God (by definition) would have to exist before the cosmos, so by the force of the premise alone, He is excluded. In this way, God's non-existence is embedded within the premise: anyone who accepts it is already logically bound to a conclusion no different from "God does not exist." This is precisely the essence of *petitio principii*—the conclusion "rides for free" within the premise.

Three Interpretative Variants of the Main Thesis

The main thesis of Richard Dawkins is formulated in a deductive form. However, some commentators point out that the author actually employs an inductive argument, merely presenting it in the guise of deduction, which leads to internal inconsistency. On the one hand, there is a firm, "hard" conclusion that God is a delusion; on the other, Dawkins himself admits that he does not possess absolute proof of God's non-existence and appeals to probability. These two conflicting interpretations are overlaid by a third possibility: that the main thesis is purely publicistic in nature and does not claim logical or scientific rigor. Therefore, the main thesis must be considered in three variants:
a) The strict (deductive) variant – analyzed in Chapter 1 as containing the error of *petitio principii*;
b) The probabilistic variant – examined in Chapter 2 as containing the error of *non sequitur*;
c) The publicistic variant – also examined in Chapter 2 as containing the error of *non sequitur*.

2. The Anti-Divine Sophism: A Probabilistic and Journalistic (Publicistic) Analysis

Defining the Scope of the Anti-Divine Sophism

In the Anti-Divine Sophism, understood in a strict sense, are we speaking of a low probability of God's existence, or rather of His non-existence or delusion?
The text of the Anti-Divine Sophism itself does not contain phrases such as "low probability" or statements like: "the best-known explanation for the origin of life today suggests a high probability of God's delusion." Instead, it is dominated by expressions of a categorical and unconditional nature, such as "any," "only" and "necessarily." This type of language leads to an unequivocal and decisive conclusion regarding God's delusion, which is reflected in the very title of the book. In doing so, the author of the Anti-Divine Sophism departs from the previously declared probabilistic approach and—in the central thesis of the work—employs absolute formulations. Such claims entail logical consequences, which formed the basis of the analysis presented in Chapter 1. In another section of the book, in the chapter "The God Hypothesis," in the context of deism, the author writes: "The trouble is that the existence of such a being, now or ever, is rather unlikely. The God hypothesis is not needed. Moreover, it is

strongly undermined by the calculus of probability." In this context, there are grounds for analyzing the Anti-Divine Sophism on probabilistic grounds as well. However, it should be noted that these two argumentative layers (categorical and probabilistic) are not clearly distinguished in the book, leading to a lack of coherence and a dilution of the logical foundations for the work's main thesis.

The *Non Sequitur* Error in Probabilistic and Publicistic Interpretations

Although the Anti-Divine Sophism is of a strict nature, it is worth considering the two remaining interpretations:

1. **Inductive, Probabilistic**: Existing evidence indicates that intelligence has been observed exclusively as a result of evolution, hence the conclusion that the existence of a Creator God is unlikely.
2. **Publicistic, Rhetorical**: The main thesis does not constitute logical or scientific reasoning but aims to persuade the reader that God is a delusion.

Re: 1. Analysis of the Non Sequitur Error – Probabilistic Interpretation

The conclusion of a low probability of God's existence, as expressed in the first interpretation, does not logically follow from premises based on "existing evidence." This type of reasoning is burdened with the error of *non sequitur*. Why? To speak of probability in a scientific or mathematical sense, it is necessary to first define the event space. In the analyzed context, Richard Dawkins does not undertake such formalization. Moreover, defining such a space would be extremely difficult: it would require considering all possible mechanisms for the emergence of intelligence—both known and hypothetical—and conducting their formal classification. Since this was not done, the claim of a "low probability" of God's existence cannot be considered scientific. It is rather an expression of intuitive conviction than an objective conclusion supported by strong evidence. Meanwhile, according to the definition of delusion adopted by the author himself, to deem belief in God a delusion, there must exist "strong contradictory evidence." A claim of low probability, not grounded in a precise probabilistic model, does not constitute such evidence.

As a result, the Anti-Divine Sophism — understood as a probabilistic argument — does not meet the formal criteria of validity. The conclusion that God is a delusion does not logically follow from the adopted premises and does not constitute strong counter-evidence. Thus, we are dealing with a logical error of the *non sequitur* type.

Re: 2. Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Error – Publicistic Interpretation

In the publicistic (journalistic) interpretation, the main thesis of the Anti-Divine Sophism — "God is a delusion"— is rhetorical in nature. Its aim is not to present scientific or logical proof but persuasion: convincing the reader of the falsity of belief in God through the power of language and

the author's authority. However, such a stylistic device cannot serve as a basis for deeming God a "delusion" in the sense defined by Richard Dawkins himself, i.e., as a "false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence." Strong evidence requires equally robust argumentation, which the publicistic interpretation inherently relinquishes. Crucially, there are no grounds to assume that the Anti-Divine Sophism is solely publicistic in character. On the contrary, the author explicitly declares that the God hypothesis is scientific in nature and should be analyzed in the same categories as other hypotheses concerning the universe. Thus, the main thesis cannot be treated as purely rhetorical or metaphorical, as this would contradict the author's intention. Therefore, even if—contrary to the author's intent—we treat the ADS as a purely publicistic statement, the conclusion "God is a delusion" still does not follow from the premises. We are thus dealing with a logical error of the *non sequitur* type: the conclusion is proclaimed without any evidential basis. Moreover, this version is even weaker than the probabilistic interpretation. In the latter, at least an attempt was made to appeal to statistical intuition; the publicistic version offers no such pretense, entirely abandoning epistemic argumentation.

ChatGPT-4o Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Error – Publicistic Version

In the publicistic (rhetorical) interpretation of the Anti-Divine Sophism (ADS), the author does not attempt to construct a rigorous argument based on scientific premises, probabilistic analysis, or a formal logical model. Instead, he employs suggestive language typical of essays, manifestos, or ideological columns. The message follows a simple rhetorical scheme:

> **Statement**: Known (biological) intelligence appears only at a late stage of the universe's evolution.
>
> **Conclusion**: This supposedly implies that God—understood as a metaphysical or creative entity—"cannot exist" or is a "delusion." In this version, there is not even a pretense of attempting probabilistic reasoning or proposing an argument based on empirical data. Reasoning is replaced by striking rhetoric, designed to evoke a strong emotional resonance in the reader. The conclusion—"God is a delusion"—appears as a slogan rather than the result of any analysis. Why does a *non sequitur* error arise here?
>
> • **First**, the biological observation (the late emergence of known intelligence) contains no implicational connection to the metaphysical status of God. The fact that known intelligence is a product of evolution does not logically entail that no other form of intelligence—including God—exists.
>
> • **Second**, there is no attempt at statistical extrapolation, as was the case in the probabilistic interpretation. In this version, the ADS does not even include phrases such as "it is unlikely" or "current knowledge suggests." The conclusion is drawn arbitrarily and directly.
>
> • **Third**, a categorical and highly assertive claim is made: "God is a delusion"—which, according to Dawkins's own definition, would require the existence of strong contradictory evidence. Yet, in the publicistic version, no such argumentation is even hinted at.
>
> As a result, we are dealing with a classic *non sequitur* error—a conclusion that does not logically follow from the premises. The rhetorical shortcut "since we have so far observed only evolutionary intelligence → therefore no other form of intelligence exists → therefore God does not exist" omits an entire chain of necessary intermediate premises. This is not merely a shortcut but a complete absence of any logical bridge.

3. Why the Main Thesis of *The God Delusion* Contains Logical Errors

Categorical Error and Trivialization of the Anti-Divine Sophism

The logical error inherent in the Anti-Divine Sophism stems not only from a hidden tautology but also from a categorical error present in the formulation: "any creative intelligences." If the author's (R. Dawkins's) starting point is naturalism and the theory of evolution, then intelligence is understood in a biological and material context. However, the use of the word "any" implies that its semantic scope includes both biological intelligences and potential supernatural entities. This leads to a categorical error—conflating the categories of material and metaphysical entities. Meanwhile, the conclusion of the ADS pertains to the existence of God, understood as a supernatural being. Thus, the inconsistent use of this category disrupts the logic of the reasoning. If the categorical error is eliminated, it becomes evident that the logical conclusion of the ADS is trivialized. The reasoning boils down to a banal thesis: "humans did not create the universe, as they appeared late, when the universe already existed." This is a true but obvious statement—it contributes nothing new and does not justify the further conclusion of "God's delusion." Consequently, the conclusion of the ADS is unwarranted. The word "any" was misused, overstepping the boundaries of logical reasoning and naturalism.

Conceptual Error – Naturalism Cannot Adjudicate the Supernatural

The attempt to undermine the existence of God through a naturalistic method constitutes a conceptual error. The Anti-Divine Sophism assumes that the truth of the existence of a supernatural being can be assessed using naturalistic methods, which, by definition, are limited to investigating empirical reality. However, in classical theology, God is not an empirical entity but a necessary and transcendent one. Employing naturalism in this analysis is akin to using the wrong tool for the wrong purpose. This does not mean that science cannot make any statements about God, but that naturalism has methodological limitations in this regard.

Artificial Intelligence as a Counterexample to the Absoluteness of the Anti-Divine Sophism

Consider the statement of the Anti-Divine Sophism: "Any creative intelligence, sufficiently complex to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution." If we accept that this process is spontaneous and self-generating, the conclusion of the ADS suggests that every intelligence must originate exclusively from such a process. However, artificial intelligence (AI) serves as a counterexample: it did not arise spontaneously but was created by another intelligence—humans. This implies that the word "only" (central to the ADS's argumentation) is not justified in an absolute sense. Here, we have an example of intelligence that is not solely the result of naturalistic evolution. Of course, one could argue that AI is an indirect product of evolution, as it was created by humans. Yet, even in this case, the absoluteness of the claim is undermined. It is sufficient that not every intelligence arises evolutionarily to refute the general premise. The strength of this counterexample lies in

demonstrating that one intelligence can create another, which aligns with the theistic model in which God, as a creative intelligence, brings into existence the world, including intelligent humans.

Error of Inconsistency with Naturalism

The phrase “any creative intelligences” presupposes the possibility of reasoning about immaterial entities, which exceeds the methodological boundary of naturalism. Naturalism does not investigate supernatural entities, as they are non-falsifiable. R. Dawkins, declaring naturalism as his epistemological foundation, oversteps the boundaries of this methodology when he uses it to make claims about God. In doing so, he undermines the coherence of his own position—either he abandons naturalism, or he has no grounds to draw such conclusions.

Inconsistency with Naturalism Error

The phrase “any creative intelligences” assumes the possibility of reasoning about immaterial entities, which exceeds the methodological boundaries of naturalism. Naturalism does not investigate supernatural entities because they are unfalsifiable. By declaring naturalism as his epistemological foundation, R. Dawkins oversteps the limits of this methodology when he uses it to make claims about God. In doing so, he undermines the coherence of his own position—either he abandons naturalism, or he has no right to draw such conclusions.

Conclusion

The Anti-Divine Sophism, in its strict, logical form as presented in *The God Delusion*, contains the error of *petitio principii*. However, if its premises are weakened and interpreted in probabilistic or rhetorical terms, the error of *non sequitur* emerges. The book’s main thesis further exceeds the methodological boundaries of naturalism, which does not authorize pronouncements about metaphysical entities.

What, then, is the main thesis of *The God Delusion*? It is a highly suggestive sophism that illusorily appeals to logic and science while, in reality, constituting the author’s worldview declaration dressed in scientific language. The conclusion that “God is a delusion” is not only illogical but also harmful and stigmatizing, as it assumes the falsity of religious belief without providing the “strong contrary evidence” required by the very definition of delusion.

The analysis revealed serious internal contradictions in the Anti-Divine Sophism:

- If treated as rhetoric, *The God Delusion* loses any scientific value.
- If treated as a logical or scientific proof, it is flawed.

As a result, Richard Dawkins failed to build a coherent epistemic bridge between evolutionism and atheism.

1. If the Anti-Divine Sophism is a strict proof, it contains the error of *petitio principii*, and thus the conclusion “God is a delusion” does not logically follow from the premises.
2. If the Sophism is a probabilistic proof, the conclusion “God is a delusion” also does not follow from the premises—there is a *non sequitur* error, as no formal probability model has been specified.
3. If the Sophism is purely rhetorical, it even more so lacks the basis for drawing a categorical conclusion. Rhetoric cannot serve as an epistemic proof—here, too, a *non sequitur* occurs.

In no possible interpretive variant—neither strict, probabilistic, nor rhetorical—does the conclusion “God is a delusion” logically follow from the premises of the Anti-Divine Sophism.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

Objections and Responses

Methodological Note

Below are key clarifications that should be taken into account when evaluating this work. I address potential objections regarding errors or overinterpretations. I expect that my responses will be considered in both AI analyses and any critical studies.

1.

Objection: The God Delusion is a popular science book, so it may contain certain simplifications. One should not expect a rigorous logical proof, an absolute argument, or even a highly probable one. By treating the Anti-Divine Sophism as a formal argument, Bloch adopts an overly academic approach that does not align with Dawkins' intention.

My Response:

The objection assumes that I impose a formal logical structure on Dawkins' text. However, I do not initiate the process of formalization — the text of The God Delusion itself exhibits these characteristics. It contains:

– A definition of God as a supernatural entity,

– The treatment of God as a scientific hypothesis,

– A definition of delusion as a "a persistent false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence…"[6]

– Reasoning using precise terms such as "any," "only," "necessary," "therefore," and "evolution," leading to the conclusion: "God is a delusion."

Thus, I do not create this structure — I merely identify and analyze it. Allow me to quote from The God Delusion: «'The God Hypothesis' is a scientific hypothesis about the universe, which should be analysed as sceptically as any other."»[7] It is not I who assigns God the status of a "scientific hypothesis"; I simply interpret the content of the assumptions in The God Delusion. The author of the book does this, and I operate within the framework of those assumptions. If this were merely a rhetorical device, it should have been clearly stated in the text — yet no such clarification exists. On the contrary, the entire style suggests an ambition to construct a serious epistemic argument, which others ignore, serving as the "scientific" basis for applying the psychopathological concept of "delusion."

Regarding the objection about inconsistency with the author's "intention": "Dawkins' intention" is to demonstrate that God is a delusion, which — by his own definition — means a false belief

[6] R. Dawkins *The God Delusion*, Transworld Publishers, 2007, p. 28

[7] Ibid., p. 24

maintained despite "strong contradictory evidence."[8] Thus, his goal is precisely to present such evidence, which believers ignore, and this ignorance serves as an additional argument against their irrational beliefs. This structure is no longer mere journalism but an attempt to logically substantiate something significant. Therefore, I do not introduce anything of my own and rely solely on the methodological assumptions adopted by R. Dawkins and his intentions.

There remains the issue of the book's character as a popular science publication. According to the objection, a book of this type is entitled to contain classic logical errors in its main thesis — concerning a matter of fundamental importance — that lead to the stigmatizing label of billions of people as carriers of "delusions." I firmly disagree with this stance. Popular science publications are meant to disseminate scientific knowledge, not flawed reasoning. When they contain errors, they cease to popularize science and begin to popularize errors, which contradicts their purpose. Moreover, The God Delusion has reached millions of readers, many of whom lack logical or methodological training. The author, aware of this, should have exercised particular care when formulating theses with such far-reaching consequences. This is especially true given that he is well aware of how complex and multifaceted the question of God's existence is. The popular science nature of the book does not absolve the author of responsibility for precision and the claims put forward.

2.

Objection: Although R. Dawkins declares a scientific approach, his audience may expect persuasion and rhetoric rather than strict logic. P. Bloch is arguing into the void.

My Response:

This is a weak objection because, as a scientist, Dawkins is not exempt from logical argumentation due to the expectations of his audience. Let us consider what persuasion and rhetoric instead of logic mean. It means that there are premises and a conclusion, but readers expect a conclusion that is not logically connected to the premises. Instead, the author presents it so suggestively that readers connect the premises to the conclusion in a non-logical way, such as emotionally. This clearly contradicts Dawkins' declared intention, which is to ambitiously provide a scientifically grounded argument for his position. The objection suggests that readers need an illusory (delusional?) and suggestive bridge rather than a true, scientific, and logical one. Yet, this illusory/delusional characteristic was supposed to apply to believers in God, not to non-believers. If one of the most significant arguments for atheism relies on creating an illusory bridge between evolution and atheism, this is an even weaker position than typical logical errors like petitio principii. It would amount to an emotional argument fundamentally lacking scientific grounding. However, I emphasize that the objection raised against me is a clear overinterpretation of Dawkins' declared intention. Dawkins defined all concepts and constructed a rigorous argument. The problem is that he got it wrong. Thus, I am the one hitting the "mark" by analyzing everything

[8] Ibid., p. 28.

strictly, while the emotional readers of The God Delusion accept the semblance of logic (deceiving themselves) and fail to recognize the truth, thereby "arguing into the void" themselves.

3.

Objection: The main thesis does not explicitly state an axiom of the "exclusivity of evolution." Dawkins states that in the world we know, every intelligence has emerged as a result of evolution, but he does not explicitly claim that "there is no other possibility."

My Response:

The objection that the main thesis of the Anti-Divine Sophism does not contain an axiom of the "exclusivity of evolution" is incorrect. I quote R. Dawkins: "Any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence **only** as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution." The word "only" explicitly indicates the absence of other possibilities. If this is not an axiom, then where is the proof of this "exclusivity"? There is none — neither in ADS nor anywhere else. The thesis is thus an assumption, not a conclusion, despite the book's promise to defend it. I adhere strictly to the precise meaning of the words used—this is not an overinterpretation but a logical reading of a text that sets itself a standard it fails to meet.

4.

Objection: Bloch's error: He demands from Dawkins a level of precision and proof that one would not typically expect from the essayistic, popularizing form of his book.

My Response:

I do not demand precision and proof from R. Dawkins without basis. I require that he adhere strictly to the rules of argumentation he himself established. Dawkins defined the rules of the game, and I operate solely within their boundaries. Dawkins defined God, designated him as a scientific hypothesis, defined delusion as a false belief held despite strong contradictory evidence, and constructed a deductive argument from which the "exclusivity" of evolution follows. He then concluded that "God, as defined above, is a delusion," implying that strong contradictory evidence exists. I do not expect Dawkins to provide strong contradictory evidence without a foundation in his own text. He himself formulated the premises, definitions, and conclusions that necessitate such evidence. Moreover, his definition of delusion clearly implies that anyone who ignores this evidence is deluded. The burden of providing "strong contradictory evidence" explicitly stems from the definition of delusion and rests on Dawkins. Thus, my analysis is not overly harsh but entirely appropriate.

I provide an example quote from The God Delusion illustrating how the author himself presents the God hypothesis: "Contrary to Huxley, I shall suggest that the existence of God is a scientific

hypothesis like any other."[9] We can therefore assert that the main thesis, which explicitly defines God in terms of a scientific hypothesis, should be analyzed within those terms.

5.

Objection: There is a philosophical problem here: if God created the universe, we could scientifically study its manifestations, so the naturalistic method would be valid.

My Response:

We can study it, but not through the method of naturalism. Science and naturalism are not the same (science ≠ naturalism). Science is a broad concept that does not a priori eliminate any form of metaphysical existence. Naturalism applies reductionism when investigating the supernatural realm. However, the purpose of the Anti-Divine Sophism was precisely to demonstrate *why* such reductionism should be applied — why such reductionism is justified — rather than axiomatically assuming that it is the default and scientifically valid position. Upon deeper reflection, we notice that the *petitio principii* fallacy extends more broadly within naturalism itself, particularly in its pronouncements about the existence of God.

Another issue is the understanding of the concept of proof. For a believer, the manifestation of God's activity is precisely animate nature, which is the subject of naturalistic inquiry. A naturalist, however, interprets nature as something independent of God. We cannot reach a conclusion about whether the fact of our existence constitutes evidence for God's existence or not. This problem arises because we are such complex beings that, on one hand, this complexity suggests purpose and design, while on the other hand, naturalists attempt to explain our existence through methods that do not reference God and do not treat the fact of our existence as evidence.

6.

Objection: The "exclusivity" of evolution is obvious, so there is nothing to discuss here; no intelligences other than those arising from evolution have ever been observed.

My Response:

The "exclusivity" of evolution is a highly non-obvious assumption, even within the framework of atheism itself. After all, it is possible to accept that other forms of intelligence could arise through different means without immediately invoking the existence of God.

There is a significant difference between the statement "intelligence can only arise from evolution" and "the intelligence observed so far has only arisen from evolution," and these represent two distinct levels of argumentation. In the first, within the context of the Anti-Divine Sophism (SA), we are dealing with a deductive argument that leads directly to atheism. In the second, we are dealing with an inductive argument that can accommodate atheism, agnosticism, and theism alike. Failing to distinguish between these is a major issue. This is precisely why the SA

[9] Ibid., s. 72.

is formulated deductively — it is designed to logically lead to atheism. This is not a coincidence or mere rhetoric but a seemingly "logical" premise intended to corner believers. However, this premise turns out to be flawed, causing the conclusion to collapse.

7.

Objection: P. Bloch takes a single sentence out of context and nitpicks it, ignoring the entirety of the work.

***My Response**:*

The main thesis (Anti-Divine Sophism) could independently stand in the scientific arena as an attempt to link evolution with atheism. I have read the entire context of the book, and despite the author's explicit declaration that he would defend this thesis, there is no defense of this position anywhere in the publication. Let us remember that the only way to substantiate the Anti-Divine Sophism is by providing evidence for the "exclusivity of evolution," and this is precisely what is missing (no such evidence exists anywhere in the world). I would like to emphasize that the Anti-Divine Sophism explicitly states that the "exclusivity" of evolution is a key argument of the book, so it should be prominently highlighted. Yet it is not. It is also worth noting that the entire context of the book was additionally analyzed by Grok3, and the results of its analysis are provided at the end of the study. The AI found no arguments or reinforcements of the main thesis anywhere in the publication.

8.

Objection: P. Bloch focuses on a single thesis, while *The God Delusion* contains many different arguments.

***My Response**:*

I have written something akin to a monograph on the main thesis, as this one issue is so significant that it warrants separate analysis. I addressed other arguments in my critical book *The Deluded God of Richard Dawkins*, including topics such as infinite regress, Russell's teapot, the burden of proof, morality, evolution in the context of Darwin, and the historical sources of Christianity. In one of the chapters, titled "The unproven statements" I argued that Dawkins failed to substantiate his announced thesis that evolution is the exclusive pathway to the emergence of intelligence. In the present discussion, I have only expanded on this particular thread to help readers of my book understand the logical consequences of the unproven axiom of "exclusivity." Without a correctly formulated main thesis, *The God Delusion* loses the foundation upon which its entire narrative is built — namely, the logical connection between evolutionism and atheism.

9.

Objection: Paweł Bloch commits the straw man fallacy by attributing a stronger form to the text than it actually has.

My Response:

This objection is unfounded. I approach the hypothesis of God exactly as Richard Dawkins himself presents it in his book. I do not alter or exaggerate any interpretive element. I analyze three distinct versions of the Anti-Divine Sophism:

1. **Strict, literal interpretation** – I demonstrate the *petitio principii* fallacy (see chapter: *The Problem of the Axiom and the Petitio Principii Fallacy*), treating God as a scientific hypothesis, exactly as Dawkins frames it. I adhere precisely to the wording of the main thesis, without introducing any modifications.
2. **Inductive, probabilistic interpretation** – I demonstrate the *non sequitur* fallacy (see chapter: *Re: 1. Analysis of the Non Sequitur Fallacy – Inductive, Probabilistic Interpretation*). In this version as well, I treat God as a scientific hypothesis, in full accordance with Dawkins' own formulation.
3. **Publicistic, rhetorical interpretation** – not a scientifically serious argument (see chapter: *Re: 2. Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Logical Fallacy – Publicistic Interpretation*). I consider this a possible post hoc reinterpretation of the main thesis.

Thus, I analyze all three versions of the main thesis, and in each case, I identify a logical fallacy that undermines the conclusion that "God is a delusion." Therefore, with regard to the existence of God, Richard Dawkins does not offer strong contradictory evidence that others ignore.

In contrast, critics of my work can easily fall into the straw man fallacy themselves by failing to recognize that I am analyzing not one, but three distinct levels of potential interpretation of Dawkins' argument—going beyond the literal reading of the text. The accusation of a straw man fallacy in my case is therefore groundless.

Let me reiterate: it is Dawkins who asserts that God is a delusion—that is, a false belief maintained despite strong contradictory evidence. According to this definition, the burden of proof (*onus probandi*) lies squarely with him.

10.

Objection: Dawkins does not present his argument in points 1, 2, 3 –> conclusion; rather, he writes in an essayistic, popularizing style.

My Response:

Anyone who carefully reads the Anti-Divine Sophism will notice that it precisely boils down to points 1, 2, 3 – conclusion. The objection raised against me is inconsistent with the facts.

11.

Objection:
R. Dawkins does not claim to provide a strict proof.

My Response:
In that case, R. Dawkins falls into a contradiction. He declares that God is a delusion — defined as "a false belief persisting despite strong counterevidence" — yet simultaneously admits that he does not possess such counterevidence, since he makes no claim to offer a strict proof. Within this context, the main thesis collapses. (See chapter: *Re: 2. Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Error – Publicistic Interpretation*).

12.

Objection: The so-called Anti-Divine Sophism was not authored by R. Dawkins but invented by P. Bloch himself, who then proceeded to refute it. Moreover, the main thesis is not a sophism. A sophism implies deliberate deception, whereas in this case, it is, at most, a logical error.

My Response:
I understand that the errors present in the Anti-Divine Sophism (SA) might give the impression that it could not have originated from *The God Delusion*, written by a world-renowned rationalist. However, what I refer to as the Anti-Divine Sophism is, in fact, a direct quotation from Chapter II, "The God Hypothesis," of *The God Delusion*, first published in 2006. The book has gone through numerous reprints in multiple languages, and the author has had many opportunities to revise or clarify the passage—but the statement remains unchanged.
It is precisely in that passage that we find the core conclusion: that God is a delusion, which also serves as the basis for the book's title. This is not a passing remark, but a central claim of the book—one that reaches beyond *The God Delusion* itself, positing that evolution constitutes "strong counterevidence" against the existence of God. The Anti-Divine Sophism is not simply an isolated or exaggerated excerpt; it represents a deeper conceptual framework concerning the relationship between nature and the Creator.
Now to the key question: Is the main thesis a sophism? A flawed line of reasoning can be called a sophism in the logical sense, without presuming deliberate intent. That is how I use the term here. Whether the sophism is intentional is harder to determine definitively. Yet *The God Delusion* contains a revealing passage in which Dawkins admits that he does not possess 100% proof that God does not exist, while at the same time presenting a chain of reasoning that unequivocally leads him to conclude that God is a delusion. This creates a tension—a contradiction between the declared lack of proof and what appears to be the delivery of a conclusive argument.
For these reasons, I regard the main thesis as a sophism in its structural sense. Whether it is also a deliberate sophism is something I leave for readers to decide.

13.

Objection: P. Bloch analyzes *The God Delusion* as though it were a formal logical treatise, whereas Dawkins' book is written in a popular science and journalistic style. This leads to several problems:

- **Contextual error** – Bloch demands from Dawkins a level of linguistic precision not expected of works intended to popularize science. He ignores the fact that the language used in *The God Delusion* is not that of formal philosophy.
- **Quibbling fallacy** – To point out formal logical errors in a book meant to popularize science is like criticizing poetry for failing to obey the rules of logic.

My Response:

I refer here to my earlier analysis of the second logical fallacy — *non sequitur* — within the publicistic interpretation of the Anti-Divine Sophism. (See chapter: *Re: 2. Analysis of the Second Non Sequitur Error – Publicistic Interpretation*).

Let me reiterate: in such a rhetorical and non-formal context, the conclusion that "God is a delusion" — defined as a false belief persisting despite strong counterevidence — is even less justified by the premises provided. Ironically, the objection raised against me only serves to magnify the structural flaws of the Anti-Divine Sophism, rather than to resolve them.

14.

Objection: Bloch rejects the broader, probabilistic reading of *The God Delusion*, insisting that Dawkins states categorically that God is a delusion. Bloch places too much emphasis—initially and exclusively—on a deductive interpretation, when he should prioritize the probabilistic one.

My Response:

I do not reject the probabilistic interpretation at all. I apply a clear research methodology and follow a logical sequence of analysis in order to maintain analytic consistency. First, I examine the text exactly as it is written—which is the natural starting point. Dawkins categorically asserts that "God is a delusion," and this is an undeniable fact emerging directly from the main thesis. I quote: "God, in the sense defined above, is a delusion." It is evident that Dawkins himself excludes the probabilistic approach in his principal argument. I merely respond accordingly.

Is this excessive on my part? Not at all. An analyst must begin with what is explicitly stated, otherwise they risk falling into overinterpretation. It is only after addressing the literal form of the argument that I proceed to analyze the probabilistic and rhetorical interpretations.

I must emphasize: the claim that I entirely reject Dawkins' probabilistic reasoning is false. I analyze this very case in the second stage of my inquiry—which is a fully methodologically justified progression: "first what is explicit, then what is inferred." If the Anti-Divine Sophism had explicitly referred to probability, that interpretation would have been considered first. But it does not.

As evidence, I refer the reader to the chapter: *Re: 1. Analysis of the Non Sequitur Error – Probabilistic Interpretation*. There, I demonstrate that the argument commits a *non sequitur*, as it lacks a defined sample space upon which any probabilistic conclusion could be built.

15.

Objection: R. Dawkins rather states: "We have no evidence of intelligence that does not arise from evolution." This is not a *petitio principii* fallacy but an inductive argument: if all known intelligences result from evolution, it is most likely that all intelligence arises in this way.

My Response:

I refer to my analysis in the chapter: *Re: 1. Analysis of the Non Sequitur Fallacy – Inductive, Probabilistic Interpretation*.

a) The fact that known intelligence originates from nature is uncontroversial — from Aristotle to modern biologists, this is a widely accepted fact. Both scientists and theists have always agreed that humans — an intelligent species — derive from nature. Thus, citing this premise (that all known intelligences result from evolution) — intended to serve as a strong probabilistic argument or to indicate a lack of evidence for non-evolutionary intelligence — offers nothing groundbreaking. It is not decisive but merely a starting point for the fundamental philosophical question: Does another intelligence exist, one that does not arise from evolution but is instead the cause of nature, even of evolution itself?

The core of the dispute is the question of the possibility of a supernatural entity's existence. Dawkins' conclusion that "God is a delusion" does not pertain to humans but to God as the transcendent source of the entire natural order. In this context, merely repeating that all known intelligences are natural lacks probative force. Dawkins implicitly shifts the boundary — suggesting he has resolved an ontological problem when, in reality, he is only describing an undisputed empirical phenomenon. By assuming that no other form of intelligence exists beyond what is observed, Dawkins sidesteps the need to prove this claim. Instead of demonstrating the non-existence of a creative entity, he simply posits that its existence is improbable. However, one cannot claim this is the most likely option when discussing an entity that, by definition, transcends empirical observation.

This issue manifests on two levels:

1. **Lack of a defined event space** – Dawkins does not present a model in which "God" would be a random event subject to probabilistic analysis.
2. **Inappropriate methodology** – Applying the tools of empirical science to a supernatural entity, which, by definition, is not subject to such methodology.

We clearly see a *non sequitur* fallacy here. It is akin to claiming that all swans are white because all swans in one pond were white.

ChatGPT-4o Opinion:

The probabilistic argument requires a space of possibilities:

• If Dawkins claims that God's existence is unlikely, he should:

o Define the space of elementary events (what are all possible states of affairs?).

o Explain in what sense "God" is a random event within this space.

• Without this, speaking of "low probability" is not even statistical but merely rhetorical.

Use of the term "delusion" requires epistemic justification:

• Even assuming atheism, labeling God a delusion implies:

o Cognitive certainty of His non-existence,

o And that human belief is a psychopathological response—a different type of claim than one derivable from empirical premises.

b) The Anti-Divine Sophism contains a fallacy by conflating what should be the subject of proving the main thesis with what actually became the subject of proof. Let us clarify this, starting with what should be the subject of proof:

1. **What should be the subject of proof**: Disproving the God hypothesis, understood as a supernatural entity existing in a set "W." This can be interpreted as the definition of God applied in the main thesis. In other words, there is an external set (W) in which God exists, and our world is His creation, a subset (set S), within which intelligences 1, 2, 3, 4… exist. We must provide proof that no other Intelligence X exists outside this set S within set W. In other words, it must be shown that God could not have created the world (S).
2. **What actually became the subject of proof in the ADS**: If the main thesis is inductive, it assumes only set S and intelligences 1, 2, 3, 4… These intelligences exist only within set S, but from the fact of 1, 2, 3, 4… in set S, a conclusion is drawn about the non-existence of object X in set W. However, there is no logical reasoning here, as set S is contained within set W.

Thus, what became the subject of proof does not disprove what should have been the subject of proof, resulting in a *non sequitur* fallacy. R. Dawkins would need to identify a specific property and provide proof that reasoning from set S justifies a conclusion about the properties of set W, but such proof is absent.

I quote a passage from my earlier publication, which clearly demonstrates this: «In the next sentence, the author said: 'Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it'. It is tacitly assumed in the above statement that before the creation of the universe there was no other reality. However, such an argument requires a proof, which is missing in the analysis of a scholar. It should be remembered that in religion (e.g. Christianity) the transcendence rather than immanence of God towards the universe is assumed. Therefore, 'creative intelligences, being evolved' do not have to 'arrive late in the universe'»[10]

16.

Objection: P. Bloch accuses R. Dawkins of failing to prove the "exclusivity of evolution" as the mechanism by which intelligence emerges, but this constitutes a reversal of the burden of proof (onus probandi). It is theism that asserts the existence of God, and therefore it is theists who bear the obligation to demonstrate it.

[10] Paweł Bloch, *Urojony Bóg Richarda Dawkinsa*, s. 34.

My Response:

This objection is not only misguided but also perverse. It is not I, but the author of The God Delusion who formulates the thesis that God is a delusion — that is, a false belief maintained despite strong contradictory evidence. Consequently, it is the author of the main thesis — not its critic — who bears the onus probandi, the burden of proof.

If the book aspires to be more than a worldview manifesto, and its author claims to rely on science and logic, then he is bound by the same principle he applies to others: he must show evidence, not merely an opinion. In the absence of such evidence, the thesis of the "delusion of God" remains an unproven belief and loses its scientific legitimacy.

17.

Objection: Bloch repeatedly suggests that since science cannot prove the "exclusivity of evolution" as the sole source of intelligence, the theistic hypothesis is equally valid. This constitutes a classic case of false equivalence.

My Response:

This is a clear overinterpretation of my argument and a misrepresentation of my position. It is self-evident that the inability to prove the "exclusivity of evolution" does not imply that the theistic hypothesis is thereby confirmed. It simply means that the theistic view is not ruled out by the assumption of evolutionary exclusivity. Therefore, the existence of God cannot be dismissed as a delusion on the basis of this unproven assumption.

18.

Objection: P. Bloch repeatedly asserts that Dawkins commits a category error by conflating material and metaphysical entities (i.e., by analyzing God using scientific methods). This claim is problematic:

a) Dawkins is not obliged to treat God as a metaphysical entity. He simply approaches God as a scientific hypothesis.

b) If God interacts with reality (e.g., by creating the universe), scientific methods can be applied to Him. Bloch fails to explain why God should be entirely immune to such investigation.

My Response:

a) Dawkins must treat God as a metaphysical entity—and here is why: he defines God as a supernatural being who created the universe. The conclusion of the Anti-Divine Sophism explicitly states that "God, as defined above, is a delusion." There is no ambiguity that a category conflation occurs here. This leads to a fundamental error, because a scientific

hypothesis—such as the one Dawkins constructs—requires alignment with the ontological category of the object under investigation.

b) If God interacts with the physical world, then scientific inquiry may in principle be justified. However, the situation becomes problematic when one attempts to study the supernatural using a method that, by definition, reduces the supernatural at the level of its own assumptions. This is precisely what Dawkins' naturalistic methodology does. Therefore, before employing a naturalistic approach to the supernatural, it is essential to first clarify what is meant by "supernatural," and to ensure that the methodology does not simply presuppose the conclusion through a reductionist framework embedded in its assumptions.

19.

Objection: The greatest flaw in Bloch's analysis is that his entire work is critical in nature and lacks any positive argument for theism. He has not demonstrated that the God hypothesis is valid; he has provided no independent evidence for the existence of God; nor has he refuted the claim that naturalism provides a better explanation of reality.

My Response:

At the very beginning of my analysis, I clearly stated the purpose of this work — and proving the existence of God was not among its objectives. Expecting such a task would be akin to demanding that a reviewer of a rejected scientific paper provide a solution to the problem in question. This is not a standard expectation in research methodology.

What does emerge from my analysis, however, is the following:

– Richard Dawkins commits a fundamental logical error.

– Richard Dawkins fails to construct a coherent epistemic bridge between evolutionism and atheism — a fact that constitutes a significant philosophical observation.

20.

Objection: The God Delusion is not a rigorous, formal proof but rather a popular science, persuasive text. Bloch simply demands strong evidence, which this type of text is not obliged to provide.

My Response:

No text is obliged to present anything, as it depends on the author's intent, and the author of The God Delusion explicitly intended to provide such evidence. The author of the Anti-Divine Sophism clearly states that "God is a delusion" (and even a dangerous one). He defines delusion as a false belief that persists despite strong contradictory evidence and then specifies that this applies to religion. Let me quote: «The dictionary supplied with Microsoft Word defines a delusion as 'a persistent false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence, especially as a symptom of

psychiatric disorder'. The first part captures religious faith perfectly. As to whether it is a symptom of psychiatric disorder, I am inclined to follow Robert M. Pirsig (…): 'When one person suffers from a delusion, it is called insanity. When many people suffer from a delusion it is called Religion.'»[11]
Thus, R. Dawkins claims to possess "strong contradictory evidence" that others ignore, leading them to succumb to this affliction. The quoted statement reveals serious implications, suggesting that religion, in some social dimension, is akin to a form of mental disorder. Such claims necessitate treating the Anti-Divine Sophism with scientific rigor, as they could lead to significant social consequences.
In summary: Dawkins set himself a high bar, and I am merely checking whether he has cleared it.

21.

Objection: Dawkins explicitly wrote elsewhere that he does not possess a 100% proof of God's non-existence, so the Anti-Divine Sophism cannot be interpreted as a proof. Here is the quote: "That you cannot prove God's non-existence is accepted and trivial, if only in the sense that we can never absolutely prove the non-existence of anything. What matters is not whether God is disprovable (he isn't) but whether his existence is *probable.*"[12]

My Response:

The quoted passage reveals a contradiction in Dawkins' argumentation, which my analysis underscores. In the Anti-Divine Sophism, Dawkins categorically asserts that "God is a delusion,"[13] defining delusion as "a false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence"[14] and presenting "the God hypothesis as scientific"[15]. This suggests a deductive proof, which, however, contains logical errors: *petitio principii* in the strict interpretation (the assumption of the "exclusivity" of evolution embeds the conclusion) and *non sequitur* in the probabilistic interpretation (lack of a formal model for "low probability").
Dawkins' own admission that the God hypothesis "cannot be disproven" undermines the ADS as the purported "strong proof" of God's delusion, confirming my objections. If Dawkins is aware that the SA, as formulated, does not prove the thesis of God's delusion, then the SA is illogical in its literal form, as it does not justify the conclusion of delusion. This strengthens my position regarding the logical error in the main thesis. However, since Dawkins elsewhere in the book claims only the probability of his position, I address this in a separate chapter (*Re: 1. Analysis of the Non Sequitur Error – Probabilistic Interpretation*).
In summary: The quote provided in the objection does not salvage the SA; on the contrary, it reinforces the thesis of its falsehood.

[11] R. Dawkins, *The God Delusion,* p.28.
[12] R. Dawkns, *The God Delusion,* p. 77.
[13] Ibid., p.52
[14] Ibid., p. 28.
[15] Ibid., p.24.

22.

Objection: In his book, in the section concerning the probabilistic interpretation of God's existence, Dawkins claims that, based on available evidence (e.g., evolution and observed intelligence in nature), the existence of God as an intelligent creator is improbable. He does not present this claim categorically.

My Response:

a) Although the primary focus of my analysis is the Anti-Divine Sophism, it is worth addressing the probabilistic language that appears in other parts of The God Delusion. Dawkins asserts that the existence of God is improbable. While this formulation may seem cautious, it draws upon scientific language without being grounded in any formal probabilistic model. In science, the term "probability" requires a model, data, and a formal structure. Using this concept intuitively, without acknowledging its informal nature, creates a disguised leap from personal opinion to a semblance of scientific knowledge. Even the rhetorical phrase "almost certainly" implies a computational foundation — one that the book never actually provides. As a result, readers may interpret it as hard evidence, when in fact it is a worldview claim.

b) Consider an analogy from biology: It was once colloquially said, "All known organisms require oxygen; therefore, it is likely that all organisms require oxygen." While practical at the time, this claim turned out to be false — anaerobic bacteria do exist. This shows how fragile generalizations can be when based on incomplete samples. Likewise, in the case of the ADS, the premise that "all known intelligences arise from evolution" does not justify the conclusion that "all possible intelligences arise exclusively from evolution" — much less that God (a metaphysical, transcendent, infinite being) is a delusion. Such an extrapolation is unjustified and leads to a non sequitur. This is all the more serious given that Dawkins himself defines God as a supernatural being — and therefore, by definition, beyond the empirical domain to which he appeals. Attempting to assess such a being with biological tools not only results in a category error but also in the illusion of proving something that lies outside the scope of the method employed.

23.

Objection: R. Dawkins essentially argues: all known intelligences originate from evolution, so every possible intelligence must also originate from evolution. This is inductive reasoning—imperfect but scientifically permissible, and thus can be considered a strong proof.

My Response:

This is a significant point. However, a serious problem overlays the overall structure of Dawkins' central thesis. If this objection is valid, Dawkins — whether consciously or not — effectively and suggestively smuggles in a second axiom, which I aim to expose here. The Anti-Divine Sophism (in the version aligned with this objection) implicitly rests on three points:

a) all known intelligence originates from evolution,

b) it is proven that evolution is a spontaneous process, devoid of any design,
c) therefore: evolution equals the absence of creation of known intelligent organisms.
On this basis, the conclusion is drawn that since all known intelligences come from evolution, every possible intelligence must as well, and thus God—as an intelligence—would also have to originate from evolution. However, evolution, as assumed, is not an act of creation; therefore, God does not exist, and belief in Him is a delusion.
The problem lies in premise b). This is a worldview axiom, not an empirical conclusion. The assumption that evolution is a spontaneous process, not a design, should be the subject of proof, not an assumption — this reveals the *petitio principii* fallacy. It is worth noting: premise b) (the spontaneity of evolution) is not exactly the same *petitio principii* fallacy as my critique of the entire Anti-Divine Sophism, but it is a specific, narrower variation tailored to the inductive interpretation. The fallacy in premise b) is "additionally hidden" because:
– in the deductive version of the Anti-Divine Sophism, the axiom of "exclusivity" is explicitly stated and central to the thesis,
– in the inductive version (objection 23), the axiom of "spontaneity" is more subtle, concealed within a seemingly empirical premise about the nature of evolution, making it harder to detect without analysis.
Both fallacies share the same logical structure (*petitio principii*: assuming the conclusion in the premise) and stem from Dawkins' naturalistic worldview, but premise b) is an additional, specific manifestation of this fallacy in the inductive context.
Dawkins addresses this topic in Chapter 4 of *The God Delusion*, titled "Why there almost certainly is no God." He attempts to partially justify the absence of design in the described evolutionary processes but concludes the chapter with a telling statement:
"This chapter has contained the central argument of my book, and so, at the risk of sounding repetitive, I shall summarize it as a series of six numbered points."
After listing these points, he adds:
"If the above argument of this chapter is accepted, the factual premise of religion – the God Hypothesis – is untenable. God almost certainly does not exist. This is a main conclusion of the book so far."[16]
This clearly shows that Dawkins does not conclude the chapter with a proof but with a conditional statement: *If the above argument of this chapter is accepted…* But this very argumentation — summarized in six points — is highly general, speculative, and heavily philosophical. It does not constitute a rigorous proof of the spontaneity of evolution, thus failing to establish the truth of premise b). This is where the *petitio principii* fallacy manifests.
I therefore have serious doubts as to whether the objection against me accurately captures Dawkins' intentions. After all, the author himself states that the God Hypothesis can only be refuted if his argumentation is accepted — that is, if it turns out to be valid. This is a fair way to frame the issue — but it also blurs the logical and epistemic rigor of his conclusion.
It can thus be pointed out that premise b)—equating evolution with the absence of design—is not logically necessary. This is well illustrated by a quote from Charles Darwin himself:

[16] Ibid., p. 187, 189.

"There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being evolved." [17]

In this view, God could have created a starting point from which—through natural mechanisms—everything else emerged. This does not negate evolution. It is simply an alternative interpretation of its origins. For this reason, premise b) cannot be considered obvious, let alone proven.

24.

Objection: It may be true that the *petitio principii* fallacy exists, but P. Bloch fails to consider that this is a persuasive text, not a strictly scientific one.

My Response:

I often hear the objection that the Anti-Divine Sophism (ADS) should be treated as a persuasive text rather than a strictly scientific one — and thus, analyzing its logical fallacies would be inappropriate. But what does "persuasive text" actually mean? It is a statement intended to convince the reader of a particular position, ideally based on rational, logical, and coherent premises. I have taken this kind of persuasiveness into account—and demonstrated that it fails to meet these criteria.

Thus, I do not reject the persuasive nature of Dawkins' book. On the contrary, I acknowledge that the author aimed to convince the reader through the strength of his arguments. My analysis focuses precisely on this: *whether those arguments are valid*. Ultimately, I conclude that they are not, as they contain the *petitio principii* fallacy (i.e., assuming in the premise what is to be proven).

One might ask: *what if the author did not intend to prove anything but only to persuade rhetorically, even at the cost of logical simplifications?* In that case, the nature of the text changes — it ceases to be a rational argument and becomes a worldview manifesto. But if so, we must openly admit this — and not expect such a book to be a substantive counterargument to religion, but rather an emotional critique of it.

However, as long as *The God Delusion* employs the language of science, hypotheses, and evidence, it is obligated to adhere to the principles of logic and intellectual honesty. I analyze this text scientifically because the author himself declared scientific and rational ambitions. If those ambitions were to be abandoned in favor of dishonest rhetoric, we would be dealing not so much with a logical conflict as with an ethical one.

[17] K. Darwin, *O powstawaniu gatunków drogą doboru naturalnego, czyli o utrzymaniu się doskonalszych ras w walce o byt*, tłum. S. Dickstein, J. Nusbaum, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Rolnicze i Leśne, Warszawa 1955, s. 515.

25.

Objection: The "weaknesses" in Bloch's analysis mainly stem from his overly meticulous logical scrutiny of *The God Delusion*, overlooking its nature as a popular and rhetorical book aimed at a broad audience.

My Response:

Logic knows no "popular science exceptions." The fact that the book is intended for a "broad audience" does not exempt it from logical responsibility, especially when it advances a strong thesis (that God is a delusion and a dangerous one), employs scientific language (evolution, the God Hypothesis as scientific, strong counterevidence, definitions of God that are refuted), and accuses billions of people of a perceptual error bordering on mental illness. Dawkins offers no suggestion whatsoever throughout the book that he might be using metaphor or some form of loose reasoning. On the contrary, he demands rational precision. To confirm this, I commissioned a full analysis of *The God Delusion* by AI. Grok3 stated: "Final verdict: Bloch's claim that Dawkins does not suggest metaphor or loose reasoning is true. *The God Delusion* consistently presents its main thesis as literal and rational, with no indications of figurative language."

Therefore, my argumentation is not overly rigorous — it is appropriate to the weight of the thesis. Moreover, readers of *The God Delusion* often consider themselves rationalists, so they are interested in the highest logical rigor, not "rhetorical" rigor. I certainly meet this need.

26.

Review/Opinion: From the perspective of formal logic, Paweł Bloch points out specific errors, but from the perspective of scientific naturalism, Dawkins operates on principles that reflect his naturalistic worldview. His argumentation aims to show that all known forms of intelligence arose through evolution, and on this basis, he claims that the concept of God (as a supernatural entity) lacks empirical grounding. From this perspective, his argumentation may be seen as internally consistent, though critics — such as Bloch — accuse it of being insufficient in terms of formal logic.

My Response to the Review/Opinion:

I analyze the argumentation contained in the Anti-Divine Sophism according to the principles established by the author himself. Since R. Dawkins claims that "God is a delusion," he — by the definition of "delusion" — implies that there are strong, countervailing pieces of evidence ignored by believers. This is a very high logical and epistemic requirement — far higher than merely stating that "the concept of God lacks empirical grounding." In this context, it is not enough for Dawkins to operate within his naturalistic worldview. If he considers his conclusion *to have the status of scientific truth*, it must also meet the requirements of logical validity and evidential rigor.

27.

Objection: Did R. Dawkins "make a mistake"? It depends on the perspective:

• From the viewpoint of formal logic — yes.
• From the viewpoint of his methodology (scientific naturalism) — no, because it does not allow for the existence of anything that cannot be empirically investigated. From this perspective, the "mistake" does not exist, as it is not recognized as a mistake but rather forms the foundation of the adopted method.

My Response:

a) In this case, the *petitio principii* fallacy appears not only in Dawkins' specific argumentation but also in the methodological assumptions of naturalism itself. This does not invalidate the objection — on the contrary, it deepens it. It means that the entire worldview foundation on which his reasoning is based may be logically flawed. Claiming that for him, it is not a "mistake" because it stems from his method is merely an apparent escape. A logical error remains an error, whether it is recognized or not, whether it comes from an accepted theory or not. And if it lies in the method, it makes the method all the more problematic.
b) One can also point out an internal inconsistency: Dawkins himself invokes the argument of infinite regress (e.g., asking, "Who created God?"), even though the concept of infinity is not subject to empirical verification. If he rejects the existence of God due to a lack of empirical evidence while simultaneously using non-empirical arguments, his methodology is not internally consistent. He allows a non-empirical concept when it serves his thesis but abandons this methodology when it is inconvenient. Thus, naturalism does not function here as a consistent verification principle but rather as a selective rhetorical tool. I do not believe the objection raised against me fully reflects R. Dawkins' views. In practice, his argumentation relies not only on empirical methods but also on philosophical and logical constructs — and these are subject to evaluation from a strict logical perspective as well.

28.

Objection: One could debate whether Bloch treated a fragment of Dawkins' book too literally (too "mathematically"), given that it is largely rhetorical and popular-scientific in nature. If someone believes that Richard Dawkins did not aim to develop a formal logical proof but only to present what he considers the "most probable" naturalistic explanation for the origin of intelligence, then Bloch, by analyzing this fragment solely as a precise deductive argument, may have deliberately sharpened the criteria.

My Response:

Even if someone believes I evaluate Dawkins' argumentation too harshly — by applying the criteria of formal logic — this does not change the main problem: the available premises do not lead to the conclusion that "God is a delusion."
If we were to set aside the "strict" part and focus only on what Dawkins formulates informally or rhetorically, we would still not obtain the robust conclusion required by the category of "delusion." After all, "delusion" is not an expression of personal skepticism but an epistemic charge — a claim that something is radically false despite the presence of strong counterevidence.

If Dawkins does not provide such evidence, his thesis loses its weight — regardless of whether he expresses it in the language of logic or popular writing.

29.

Objection: Artificial intelligence, when searching for weaknesses in this analysis, despite these explanations, considers the weakness of the argumentation to be its excessive rigor, overinterpretation of Dawkins, etc.

My Response:

This type of objection may stem from a superficial treatment of my analysis or a failure to consider its full scope. However, when all my responses are carefully examined, it becomes clear that the argumentation forms a coherent and logical structure.

I addressed the Anti-Divine Sophism in all three variants: strict (deductive), probabilistic, and broad, popular-scientific. Each variant was considered separately, in accordance with the rules that Dawkins — explicitly or implicitly — adopted.

For this reason, my analysis cannot be accused of overinterpretation — on the contrary, its rigor ensures that no version of the Anti-Divine Sophism remains untouched by critical reflection. If an analysis is to be complete, it must also be consistent.

30.

Objection: Richard Dawkins' *The God Delusion* is a popular science book aimed at a broad audience, not an academic philosophical or logical treatise. In such texts, authors often use simplifications, rhetoric, and persuasive formulations that do not always meet the rigors of formal logic but are intended to convey ideas in an accessible way. As a science popularizer, Dawkins employs categorical statements in the Anti-Divine Sophism (e.g., "exclusively," "delusion") and scientific language to persuade readers of his naturalistic worldview, but he does not necessarily aim to provide a strict mathematical or philosophical proof.

My Response:

In the case of *The God Delusion*, we encounter a clear contradiction: on the one hand, the author adopts a popularizing, sometimes even anecdotal style that allows for simplifications and rhetoric; on the other, he uses the term "delusion," which carries a very serious semantic and epistemic commitment.

Calling God a "delusion" is not a neutral expression of a worldview. It is a claim that the belief in God's existence is not only mistaken but radically false, despite the alleged existence of counterevidence that believers supposedly ignore or dismiss. Such a strong conclusion requires not just persuasion—it demands coherent and rigorous justification, regardless of whether the book is scientific or popular in nature.

For this reason, to maintain intellectual integrity, I analyzed the Anti-Divine Sophism in three possible variants: deductive, probabilistic, and popular (rhetorical). In none of these approaches can the conclusion that "God is a delusion" be logically justified.
This is not a matter of excessive rigor. It is a matter of responsibility for the word, especially when it becomes the cornerstone of an entire argument—and perhaps an attempt to undermine the foundations of a worldview that provides real support for millions of people.

31.

Objection: R. Dawkins is not so much a philosopher as a worldview-driven science popularizer. He writes to encourage people toward rational, logical thinking and to move away from irrational religion. Bloch, however, focuses on the logic of the arguments, overlooking this emotional and social mission.

My Response:

This objection contains an internal contradiction that exposes its author's inconsistency. It is Richard Dawkins himself — not I — who established logic and scientific rationality as the foundation of his position. In *The God Delusion*, he explicitly states: "the existence of God is a scientific hypothesis, like any other."[18]
Since he defines his approach as scientific, rather than merely journalistic or emotional, logical and philosophical criteria for evaluation are not only justified — they are necessary. One cannot simultaneously champion rationalism as a value and defend against logical analysis by claiming it is just a popularizing text. That would be like saying, "I encourage logical thinking — but don't judge my arguments too logically."
In essence, I am doing exactly what Dawkins himself advocated: subjecting his claims to critical analysis based on logic and coherence. As a result of this analysis, it becomes clear that his main thesis does not meet its own standards of rationality. I point out that:
– it relies on unproven premises,
– it contains classic logical fallacies (*petitio principii*, *non sequitur*),
– it does not meet the criteria of a scientific hypothesis, despite being presented as one.
If someone argues that logic should not be applied to a book with a "social mission," they should remember: one cannot simultaneously invoke the authority of science and demand exemption from its rules. Nor can one speak of a socially positive mission while failing to take responsibility for one's words.

32.

Objection: The main thesis speaks of the delusion of God, not the "non-existence of God"—these are two different things, as Dawkins himself says he does not have 100% proof of God's non-existence.

[18] Ibid., p.72.

My Response:

This objection reveals a deep contradiction in how Dawkins presents his position (I already mentioned this in response no. 21). However, another very significant issue deserves emphasis here.

By using the phrase “God is a delusion,” Dawkins raises his own evidential bar. The claim of God’s non-existence is an ontological statement. In contrast, “the delusion of God” is an ontological + epistemological claim — it suggests not only that God does not exist but that there are strong counterevidences that people consciously ignore.

Yet, the premises of the Anti-Divine Sophism aim solely toward an ontological proof, e.g., “any creative intelligence, sufficiently complex to design anything, can arise only as a product of evolution.” There are no premises about ignoring strong evidence, so the epistemological component necessary to justify the conclusion of “delusion” is missing.

Thus, we face a situation where the conclusion (delusion) includes elements absent from the premises — a logical error. This is a serious problem because “delusion” is a qualified form of negative judgment. It means not only that something does not exist but that there is strong evidence of its non-existence, and that people ignore it.

In short: Delusion = strong counterevidence + ignorance of that evidence.

Since the first element (evidence) is absent, the second (ignorance) is baseless — and the use of the term “delusion” becomes purely rhetorical, ultimately an invective.

If Dawkins had called God an “unnecessary hypothesis” (as Laplace did — without adding that it is “scientific”), there would be no need to prove God’s non-existence. But “lack of need” does not imply “necessity of absence.” The word “delusion,” however, implies the existence of strong evidence that has been ignored.

This problem is compounded by the semantic ambiguity of the term “delusion.” Dawkins oscillates between its cognitive meaning (a false belief despite evidence) and its clinical or colloquial connotations (e.g., “irrationality,” “stupidity,” “mental illness”).

Such ambiguity — combined with the lack of evidence — makes the word a rhetorical bomb that ultimately backfires on the author. When someone demands a high standard of rationality but fails to meet it, they harm both the readers who trusted a seemingly coherent argument and their own authority as an intellectual.

Final remarks for the entire chapter:

The above responses address the key objections. They should be considered alongside the cited quotes (from both analysts and AI) when addressing critical remarks regarding this work.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE VERIFICATION

Grok3

Grok3 AI Analysis

Question to Grok3:

Answer the 11 questions posed in P. Bloch's analysis in the context of the full text of The God Delusion.

Grok3 Response (Think):

Below is a comprehensive response to the 11 questions posed in P. Bloch's analysis of Richard Dawkins' *The God Delusion*, based on a thorough examination of the full text of the book as provided in the query. The answers verify Bloch's theses in the context of Dawkins' work, focusing on the central thesis referred to as the "Anti-Divine Sophism" (ADS).

---

1. What is the central thesis of *The God Delusion* — the so-called Anti-Divine Sophism (ADS)? Quote its content. Who is its author? How is it defined by the author himself? Does it serve as a bridge between evolution and atheism? Verify whether R. Dawkins succeeded in building such a bridge.

Central Thesis (ADS): The central thesis of *The God Delusion*, termed the "Anti-Divine Sophism" by P. Bloch, is explicitly stated in Chapter 2, "The God Hypothesis." Dawkins writes:

"Instead I shall define the God Hypothesis more defensibly: there exists a superhuman, supernatural intelligence who deliberately designed and created the universe and everything in it, including us. This book will advocate an alternative view: any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution. Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it. God, in the sense defined, is a delusion; and, as later chapters will show, a pernicious delusion."

Author: Richard Dawkins, a British evolutionary biologist and former professor at the University of Oxford.

Author's Definition: Dawkins defines the "God Hypothesis" as a scientific hypothesis concerning the universe, subject to skeptical analysis akin to any other scientific claim. He positions it as a testable assertion rather than a philosophical or metaphysical one, aiming to evaluate it through empirical and rational means.

Bridge Between Evolution and Atheism: Yes, the thesis attempts to connect evolution to atheism by asserting that any intelligence capable of designing complex systems, including a hypothetical God, must itself be a product of gradual evolution. Since evolution occurs within the universe and thus postdates its origin, no such intelligence could have designed the universe, leading to the conclusion that God does not exist. This is intended as a logical bridge from evolutionary theory to the rejection of a supernatural creator.

Verification of Success: Dawkins does not succeed in building this bridge. His argument hinges on the unproven premise that evolution is the *only* mechanism by which complex intelligence can arise. Throughout *The God Delusion*, particularly in Chapter 4 ("Why There Almost Certainly Is No God"), he fails

to provide evidence excluding other possible origins for intelligence, such as a pre-existing supernatural entity. The text relies on the assertion that "creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late," but offers no empirical or logical proof that this applies universally, including to a transcendent God. This gap undermines the bridge, as evolution's role in explaining biological intelligence does not inherently preclude a non-evolved, supernatural designer of the universe itself.

---

2. Verify whether, in the strict logical sense, the central thesis of *The God Delusion* indeed contains logical fallacies. Is the main thesis of *The God Delusion* a sophism?

Logical Fallacies: Yes, the central thesis contains logical fallacies in a strict sense:

- **Petitio Principii (Begging the Question):** In its deductive form, the thesis assumes that "any creative intelligence… comes into existence only as the end product of… evolution". This premise presupposes that all intelligence, including a supernatural God, must evolve—a conclusion the argument seeks to prove. By embedding the outcome (God cannot exist as a pre-universe designer) within the premise, the reasoning is circular. No evidence in the book justifies this exclusivity beyond Dawkins' naturalistic assumption.
- **Non Sequitur (Does Not Follow):** In probabilistic or publicistic interpretations (e.g., Chapter 4's "almost certainly" claim), the conclusion that God is a delusion or improbable does not logically follow from the premise that known intelligences evolved. The leap from biological evolution to the non-existence of a supernatural entity lacks a formal probabilistic model or evidential link, rendering it a non sequitur.

Sophism: Yes, the thesis qualifies as a sophism—a flawed argument presented persuasively to appear valid. Dawkins employs scientific rhetoric and authoritative language (e.g., "necessarily," "delusion") to mask the logical weaknesses, potentially misleading readers into accepting the conclusion without scrutiny. The persuasive style, evident in the introduction and throughout, overshadows the absence of rigorous proof, aligning with the definition of sophism as flawed reasoning cloaked in eloquence.

---

3. Would eliminating the logical fallacies from Dawkins's argument create a problem, such that the definitive conclusion — "God is a delusion" — could no longer be sustained? Would the title *The God Delusion* lose its evolutionary justification?

Impact of Eliminating Fallacies: Yes, removing the fallacies undermines the conclusion "God is a delusion." To avoid petitio principii, Dawkins would need to prove that evolution is the sole mechanism for intelligence—a task unfeasible with current scientific knowledge, as the book provides no such evidence (e.g., Chapter 4 lacks empirical exclusion of non-evolutionary intelligence). Without this unproven exclusivity, the argument cannot rule out a pre-universe, non-evolved intelligence, collapsing the claim of delusion. Similarly, correcting the non sequitur requires a logical link from evolved intelligence to God's non-existence, which is absent. Thus, the definitive conclusion cannot stand.

Title Justification: The title *The God Delusion* would lose its evolutionary basis. Without the fallacies, the argument reduces to a trivial observation: evolved intelligences (like humans) cannot have designed the universe because they appeared later (a point not disputed). This does not address a supernatural God's existence, nor does it justify "delusion" as a false belief against strong evidence (per Dawkins' definition). The evolutionary link to atheism dissolves, leaving the title unsupported by the revised argument.

4. Does the thesis on the low probability of God's existence — which is one of the book's central claims — fail due to a non sequitur fallacy? Can the conclusion "God is a delusion" still hold if the central thesis is interpreted as a journalistic or rhetorical statement?

Low Probability Thesis and Non Sequitur: Yes, the claim of God's low probability (Chapter 4, "Why There Almost Certainly Is No God,") fails due to a non sequitur. Dawkins argues that a complex God is improbable because known complexity arises from evolution (e.g., the "Ultimate Boeing 747" analogy). However, he provides no formal probabilistic model—such as an event space or statistical framework—to quantify this improbability. The conclusion that God's existence is "almost certainly" false does not follow from the premise of evolved complexity, as it does not exclude a non-evolved, supernatural intelligence. This intuitive leap lacks evidential support, constituting a non sequitur.

Journalistic/Rhetorical Interpretation: No, the conclusion "God is a delusion" does not hold as a rhetorical statement. Dawkins defines delusion as "a persistent false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence". A journalistic or persuasive claim requires such evidence to meet this standard, yet the book offers none beyond rhetorical assertions (e.g., introduction: "Imagine a world without religion"). Without robust proof, the conclusion becomes an unsupported slogan, failing even as rhetoric to align with Dawkins' own definition of delusion.

---

5. If Dawkins's Anti-Divine Sophism were stripped of its logical errors, would it reduce to the trivial claim that "man did not create the universe"?

Trivialization: Yes, without logical errors, the ADS reduces to "man did not create the universe." Eliminating petitio principii requires removing the assumption that all intelligence evolves, leaving only the observation that human intelligence—being evolved—emerged late (a fact uncontested). This does not address a supernatural God, as the corrected argument lacks premises to exclude a non-evolved designer. The book's focus on evolution (e.g., Chapter 4) applies to biological entities, not metaphysical ones, rendering the conclusion trivial and irrelevant to the God Hypothesis as defined.

---

6. Why did R. Dawkins make a mistake? Is this error significant? Does it stem from the very foundations of his philosophical stance?

Reason for Mistake: Dawkins' mistake lies in assuming, without proof, that evolution is the only mechanism for intelligence (ADS). He extends biological evolution to all possible intelligences, including God, without justifying this exclusivity (e.g., Chapter 4's "Ultimate Boeing 747" assumes complexity requires evolution).

Significance: The error is highly significant, as it undercuts the central argument of *The God Delusion*. The conclusion that God is a delusion relies on this unproven premise; without it, the book fails to disprove a supernatural designer, weakening its atheistic claim (evident across Chapters 2-4).

Philosophical Stance: Yes, the mistake stems from Dawkins' naturalistic worldview, which a priori rejects the supernatural (introduction: God as a scientific hypothesis). This bias leads him to overextend empirical science into metaphysical claims, assuming naturalism precludes non-evolved intelligence without demonstrating why (e.g., no discussion of transcendence in Chapter 2).

7. By approximately what percentage does the epistemic value of *The God Delusion* decline, based solely on the presence of formal logical errors? Provide a methodological assessment.

Epistemic Decline: The epistemic value declines by approximately 50%.

- **Methodological Assessment:** The book's value lies in two areas: popularizing evolution (e.g., Chapter 4's natural selection arguments) and critiquing religion (e.g., Chapters 7-9). The logical errors—petitio principii and non sequitur—in the central thesis (ADS) undermine its claim to disprove God's existence, a core objective (introduction). While evolution and social critique retain merit, the failure to establish a sound argument against God halves its epistemic credibility as a philosophical or scientific refutation of theism. This estimate reflects the balance between retained explanatory power and lost argumentative rigor.

---

8. Does the analysis reveal something deeper — namely, the absence of a true bridge between evolutionism and atheism?

Deeper Revelation: Yes, the analysis exposes the absence of a true bridge. Evolution explains biological complexity (Chapter 4), but Dawkins does not demonstrate why it excludes a supernatural designer of the universe itself (e.g., no rebuttal to a God initiating evolution). The ADS assumes this exclusion, but the book lacks evidence or reasoning to bridge the empirical (evolution) to the metaphysical (atheism), revealing a reliance on naturalistic assertion rather than proof (e.g., Chapter 2's scientific framing does not address transcendence).

---

9. Is the central thesis of *The God Delusion*, authored by Prof. Richard Dawkins, ultimately illusory — drawing the reader into a conceptual delusion?

Illusory Nature: Yes, the thesis is illusory. It promises a scientific disproof of God (introduction, ADS) but rests on unproven assumptions (evolution's exclusivity) and logical fallacies. Its persuasive rhetoric (e.g., "pernicious delusion,") masks these flaws, potentially misleading readers into accepting a conclusion without "strong contradictory evidence" (per Dawkins' definition). This aligns with the concept of delusion Dawkins critiques, ironically drawing readers into a conceptual trap.

---

10. Provide a methodological rating that evaluates whether R. Dawkins himself succumbs to an illusion. Paradoxically, if someone claims that the Anti-Divine Sophism (despite its demonstrated logical flaws) constitutes a "strong counter-proof" for the conclusion "God is Patterns a delusion", would such a person fall into delusion? Assess the degree of such delusion.

Dawkins' Illusion: Rating: 8/10. Dawkins succumbs to an illusion by presenting a flawed argument as robust due to his naturalistic bias (e.g., ADS). He overlooks the lack of proof for evolution's exclusivity and the logical gaps, projecting scientific authority onto a shaky thesis (e.g., Chapter 4's intuitive probability).
Claim of "Strong Counter-Proof": Yes, such a person would be deluded. Ignoring demonstrated flaws (petitio principii, non sequitur) to assert "strong counter-proof" contradicts Dawkins' own standard of

evidence. **Degree:** 7/10—significant but less severe than Dawkins', as it stems from trust in authority rather than crafting the flawed argument.

---

11. Identify any errors made by P. Bloch. Take into account his responses and determine whether they undermine the conclusion that the central thesis of *The God Delusion* contains either a petitio principii or non sequitur fallacy.

Errors by P. Bloch: No significant errors are identified. Bloch's analysis aligns with the text of *The God Delusion*, accurately pinpointing the ADS and its flaws. His responses to objections (e.g., popular science nature, rhetorical intent) reinforce his critique by emphasizing Dawkins' self-imposed scientific standard and the evidential burden of "delusion".
Undermining Conclusions: No, Bloch's arguments strengthen his conclusion. The petitio principii (unproven exclusivity) and non sequitur (unjustified leaps) are evident in the book's text and unaddressed by Dawkins, validating Bloch's logical assessment.

Summary

P. Bloch's analysis holds up against the full text of *The God Delusion*. The central thesis (ADS) contains petitio principii in its deductive form and non sequitur in probabilistic or rhetorical forms, failing to bridge evolution and atheism. Dawkins' naturalistic bias and lack of evidence undermine his claim, reducing the book's epistemic value and rendering its thesis illusory. Bloch's critique is methodologically sound, with no significant errors detracting from his conclusions.

Grok 3 (Think) 2025 r.

Verification of Logical Fallacies in the Context of *The God Delusion*

Grok3

Verification of Logical Fallacies in the Context of *The God Delusion*

Question to Grok3:

Check chapter by chapter whether the full publication of The God Delusion explains or eliminates P. Bloch's objections.

Grok3 (Think) response:

Answer in English

The full publication of Richard Dawkins' *The God Delusion* has been analyzed chapter by chapter in light of Paweł Bloch's objections. Bloch accuses Dawkins' main thesis of logical fallacies: *petitio principii* (circular reasoning) and *non sequitur* (non-sequitur) in its probabilistic and publicistic interpretations, as well as a lack of a logical bridge between evolutionism and atheism. Below is an analysis of each chapter to determine whether Dawkins explains or eliminates these objections anywhere in the book.

Introduction

Dawkins states the book's goal: to persuade readers toward atheism and portray religion as a delusion, defining delusion as "a false belief maintained despite strong contrary evidence." The introduction is persuasive but lacks logical arguments or evidence for the exclusivity of evolution as the mechanism for intelligence. There is no bridge between evolution and atheism. Bloch's objections remain unaddressed.

Chapter 1: A Deeply Religious Non-Believer

Dawkins critiques the undeserved respect for religion and advocates atheism as a respectful stance toward a godless world. The chapter offers no logical arguments supporting the main thesis, no reference to the "exclusivity" of evolution, and no bridge to atheism. Bloch's objections stand.

Chapter 2: The God Hypothesis

The main thesis emerges: "Any creative intelligence, sufficiently complex to design anything, can only emerge as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution."

- **Petitio Principii:** No evidence supports the exclusivity of evolution – the assumption that intelligence must evolve already contains the conclusion of God's non-existence.
- **Non Sequitur:** A contradiction exists between calling religion a "delusion" and later suggesting a "low probability" of God, without a formal probabilistic model.
- **Bridge:** Treating the God Hypothesis as scientific does not rule out a supernatural entity, weakening the link to atheism. Bloch's objections are neither explained nor eliminated.

Chapter 3: Arguments for God's Existence

Dawkins critiques classical theistic arguments (e.g., Aquinas, ontological) as weak. This critique does not bolster the claim of evolution's exclusivity or justify God's non-existence. Evolution is not mentioned, so the bridge to atheism is absent. Bloch's objections remain valid.

Chapter 4: Why There Almost Certainly Is No God

The "Ultimate Boeing 747" argument suggests that a complex God is improbable and evolution better explains life.

- **Petitio Principii:** The assumption that complex intelligence must result from evolution lacks supporting evidence.
- **Non Sequitur:** Intuitive probability without formal calculations does not justify the conclusion of God's non-existence.
- **Bridge:** Evolution explains biology but does not exclude a supernatural designer of the universe.

  Bloch's objections remain unaddressed.

Chapter 5: The Roots of Religion

Dawkins explains the evolutionary origins of religion as a byproduct. This does not address evolution's exclusivity or imply God's non-existence. Bloch's objections stand.

Chapter 6: The Roots of Morality

Dawkins argues that morality has evolutionary roots and does not require God. This explanation does not prove God's non-existence or support evolution's exclusivity. There is no bridge to atheism, and Bloch's objections remain valid.

Chapter 7: The "Good Book" and the Changing Moral Zeitgeist

Dawkins critiques biblical morality and shows how morality evolves over time. This does not relate to the main thesis or provide evidence for evolution's exclusivity. Bloch's objections are untouched.

Chapter 8: What's Wrong with Religion? Why Be So Hostile?

Dawkins critiques religious fundamentalism and its negative social impacts. The persuasive rhetoric does not address Bloch's logical objections, evolution's exclusivity, or a bridge to atheism.

Chapter 9: Childhood, Abuse, and the Escape from Religion

Dawkins criticizes religious indoctrination of children and advocates for education without religion. There is no reference to the main thesis or Bloch's objections, which remain intact.

Chapter 10: A Much-Needed Gap?

Dawkins critiques religion as a source of comfort and inspiration, arguing that science can fulfill these roles. This does not address Bloch's objections or provide evidence for evolution's exclusivity.

Additional Sections: Appendix, Bibliography, Notes

These sections contain sources and additional information but offer no arguments supporting the main thesis or eliminating Bloch's objections.

Summary

In no chapter of *The God Delusion* does Dawkins explain or eliminate Paweł Bloch's objections. He provides no evidence for the exclusivity of evolution as the sole mechanism for intelligence, confirming the *petitio principii* fallacy. In the probabilistic interpretation, there is no formal model

for God's "low probability," and in the publicistic interpretation, rhetoric does not substitute for evidence, confirming the *non sequitur* fallacy. There is also no logical bridge between evolution and atheism, as evolution does not preclude a supernatural designer. Bloch's objections remain valid.

Grok3 (Think) 2025 r.

Questions for the Artificial Intelligence

Methodological Note:

The questions are an integral part of the study, which the AI should answer or at least suggest an answer to by analyzing the text.

Verify P. Bloch's theses and respond to the following issues:

1. What is the central thesis of *The God Delusion* — the so-called Anti-Divine Sophism (ADS)? Quote its content. Who is its author? How is it defined by the author himself? Does it serve as a bridge between evolution and atheism? Verify whether R. Dawkins succeeded in building such a bridge.
2. Verify whether, in the strict logical sense, the central thesis of *The God Delusion* indeed contains logical fallacies. Is the main thesis of *The God Delusion* a sophism?
3. Would eliminating the logical fallacies from Dawkins's argument create a problem, such that the definitive conclusion — *"God is a delusion"* — could no longer be sustained? Would the title *The God Delusion* lose its evolutionary justification?
4. Does the thesis on the low probability of God's existence — which is one of the book's central claims — fail due to a *non sequitur* fallacy? Can the conclusion *"God is a delusion"* still hold if the central thesis is interpreted as a journalistic or rhetorical statement?
5. If Dawkins's Anti-Divine Sophism were stripped of its logical errors, would it reduce to the trivial claim that *"man did not create the universe"*?
6. Why did R. Dawkins make a mistake? Is this error significant? Does it stem from the very foundations of his philosophical stance?
7. By approximately what percentage does the epistemic value of *The God Delusion* decline, based solely on the presence of formal logical errors? Provide a methodological assessment.
8. Does the analysis reveal something deeper — namely, the absence of a true bridge between evolutionism and atheism?
9. Is the central thesis of *The God Delusion*, authored by Prof. Richard Dawkins, ultimately illusory — drawing the reader into a conceptual delusion?
10. Provide a methodological rating that evaluates whether R. Dawkins himself succumbs to an illusion. Paradoxically, if someone claims that the Anti-Divine Sophism (despite its demonstrated logical flaws) constitutes a "strong counter-proof" for the conclusion *"God is a delusion"*, would such a person fall into delusion? Assess the degree of such delusion.
11. Identify any errors made by P. Bloch. Take into account his responses and determine whether they undermine the conclusion that the central thesis of *The God Delusion* contains either a *petitio principii* or *non sequitur* fallacy.

Epilogue

Dear Reader,

You have journeyed with me through the recesses of reason, along corridors of arguments, to the doors behind which echo the greatest mysteries of existence. Thank you for your company on this expedition. We may not have found a definitive answer to the question of our ultimate origin—but I hope we have together glimpsed how complex and fascinating the topic of beginnings is.

I invite you to further journeys—I hope my future works will spark inspiration, encourage new discoveries, and perhaps offer a moment of reflection where reason meets mystery.

I would also like to acknowledge the bold contribution to this debate by Professor Richard Dawkins. His book, though controversial, has allowed us to explore the boundaries of science, the power of logic, and to pose many intriguing questions.

ISBN 978-83-969690-7-1